



architects

a publication of the california architects board ■ public protection through examination, licensure, and regulation



SUMMER 2006

CIDP/IDP: A Review of the Necessary Steps

Effective January 1, 2005, new California candidates [and inactive candidates who apply for re-eligibility to take the Architects Registration Examination (ARE) after December 31, 2004] are required to complete the Comprehensive Intern Development Program/Intern Development Program (CIDP/IDP). This requirement must be fulfilled before an individual is eligible to take the California Supplemental Examination and prior to licensure in California.

IDP is the nationally recognized training program for architectural interns administered and maintained by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB). CIDP is the evidence-based overlay required by the California Architects Board (CAB) that is completed simultaneously with the IDP requirement.

To assist candidates in understanding the requirements of CIDP/IDP, following is a description of the process for California candidates seeking licensure.

ESTABLISH ELIGIBILITY

Candidates should ensure they have met one of the eligibility requirements to participate in CIDP/IDP. Those requirements are as follows:

- Three years in a National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) or Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB) accredited professional degree program;
- Currently enrolled in the third year of a four-year pre-professional degree program in architecture accepted for direct entry to a NAAB- or CACB-accredited professional degree program;
- One year in a NAAB- or CACB-accredited Master of Architecture degree program for candidates with undergraduate degrees in another discipline;
- 96 semester credit hours as evaluated by NAAB in accordance with NCARB's education requirement, of which no more than 60 hours can be in general education subject areas; or
- Three years of education equivalents based on CAB's Table of Equivalents, as evaluated by CAB (see CAB's Web site at www.cab.ca.gov under Candidate Information, for the Table of Equivalents).

ESTABLISH FILES WITH NCARB AND CAB

Candidates must be participating in IDP to participate in CIDP. In general, to participate in CIDP/IDP, candidates need to establish a file with both NCARB and CAB.

Continued on page 4



President's Message

By Jeffrey D. Heller, FAIA, Board President

Access to the Profession

At the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) annual meeting, a resolution permitting candidates to take the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) while completing their internship was considered. Resolution 06-12 was supported by our Board and passed on a vote of 45-6.

NCARB should be commended for promoting flexibility on the path to licensure. This has been an ongoing issue for interns for years, and it makes sense to promote this latitude. Such flexibility is even more important as firms struggle to find young professionals to hire.

California's eligibility standards are even more flexible than the standard in the NCARB resolution. We encourage other state boards to consider making the ARE available to candidates upon graduation or sooner. Both the profession and the environment in which students and interns must operate have changed, and a "one size fits all" requirement for exam eligibility may no longer be effective.

We also appreciate that licensing standards are a complex equation. By adopting NCARB's Intern Development Program (IDP) together with our evidence-based overlay (Comprehensive IDP), we believe CAB has enhanced the path to obtaining a license. But the addition of a new licensure requirement can affect other elements of licensure. We will be studying the impact of our structured internship requirement as we prepare for our next Sunset Review report.

It is equally important that we make sure the new program works. That is why we have focused so much on outreach to share information about the program. We are also implementing a new on-line resource that will list firms participating in our structured internship program. By doing this, we hope to create a valuable tool for interns seeking to connect with firms.

I also wish to compliment the emerging professionals and architects who took the time to comment to the Board about the NCARB resolution. Such feedback is extremely important, and we are always pleased to hear your opinion. Our Board encourages continuing comments as an important part of the refinement process. Our goal is a vital, capable, and relevant profession.

Note: The new NCARB ARE/IDP policy that was the basis for Resolution 06-12 does contain a qualifier: interns must complete a minimum of 250 Training Units prior to taking the ARE, and interns will not be able to take some divisions of the ARE (yet to be determined) until IDP is completed. Further details about grandfathering, transition, and other provisions will be the subject of a 2007 resolution.

Board Member

A P P O I N T M E N T S

Governor Schwarzenegger reappointed Jeffrey Heller as an architect member of the Board on June 6, 2006. Heller has served on the Board since 2002 and has been practicing architecture in San Francisco for over 35 years. He founded Heller Manus Architects in 1984 and serves as president. Heller was partner in the architecture firm KMD from 1977 to 1984 and was previously a designer for the firms Gensler, Jim Ream, and SOM. Heller's term expires in June 2009.

The Senate Rules Committee reappointed Cynthia Choy Ong as a public member of the Board. She has served on the Board since 2000. Ong has taught in the Los Angeles Unified School District, the Los Angeles Community College system, and at the University of California, Los Angeles. As an attorney, she has served as a state deputy public defender and a state deputy attorney general. She completed her undergraduate work at UCLA and earned her JD at UCLA School of Law. Ong's term expires in June 2010.



Governor Schwarzenegger appointed Marilyn Lyon as a public member of the Board on June 6, 2006. A resident of Rancho Palos Verdes, Lyon has been the owner of Lyon & Associates Marketing and Public Relations since 1991. Lyon served on the Rancho Palos Verdes City Council from 1993 to 2001. She served as mayor of the city in 1996 and 2001. Lyon's term expires in June 2008.



Governor Schwarzenegger appointed Michael Merino, as an architect member of the Board on June 6, 2006. A resident of Orange, Merino has served as principal and chief executive officer of Michael Merino Architects since 1996. Prior to establishing his firm, Merino served as project architect for WLC Architects from 1986 to 1996 and project coordinator for FFJ Architects from 1982 to 1986. Merino is also a Commander in the Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy Reserve, currently assigned to the United States Pacific Command, Engineer Directorate. He served in Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003. Merino's term expires in June 2009.



Governor Schwarzenegger appointed Sheran Voigt as a public member of the Board on June 2, 2006. A resident of Chino Hills, Voigt has nearly 30 years of experience as a real estate agent and broker. Voigt has served as a broker associate for the Western Group since 1997. She was broker and owner of American Dream Properties from 1994 to 1997 and broker and office manager for the Western Group from 1991 to 1997. She was also a real estate agent and broker in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the state of Alabama from 1977 to 1985. Voigt's term expires in June 2010.

the **4** Stages of a License

The decision to retire, to retread, or to not retire from the practice of architecture is an individual choice each licensee may face. Should I “hang it up” completely for pursuit of travel and leisure activities, “downsize to those fun little projects” missed during corporate practice, or perhaps freelance consult to other licensees? Such career choices should be evaluated with full knowledge of the license options available as well as one’s business and personal “new life” goals.

There are four stages or status conditions for the license issued by the California Architects Board. (Licenses under disciplinary action, such as suspension or revocation, are not covered in this article.) The first three stages are the most commonly known and generally understood; however, the fourth stage may present a new and interesting option for licensees contemplating retirement.

During a professional career, a license to practice architecture may pass through many of the four stages; however, it will always be in one of the following four stages:

1 CURRENT: An architect license remains in current status by the licensee filing an application for renewal and paying the renewal fee every two years on or before the biennial license renewal date. The holder of a current license retains all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of being a licensed architect.

[Ref.: *Business & Professions Code (BPC) sections 5500, 5536 & 5600*]

What can I do? Holders of a current license are authorized to practice architecture in accordance with the provisions of the Architects Practice Act.

What can I call myself? Holders of a current license are authorized to use the title “architect” and to use any terms such as “architecture” or “architectural” in describing their qualifications and the services they provide.

2 DELINQUENT (renewable): An architect license enters the delinquent status when it is not renewed on or before the biennial renewal date.

[Ref.: *BPC sections 5600 & 5600.1*]

What can I do? Holders of a delinquent license are not authorized to practice architecture. Such persons may operate as an “unlicensed” person as is permitted in the Architects Practice Act for any other “unlicensed” person.

What can I call myself? Holders of a delinquent license may not use the title “architect” or any terms such as “architecture” or “architectural,” or any term confusingly similar in describing their qualifications and/or any services provided while operating as an “unlicensed” person.

Can it be renewed? As long as the license is not suspended or revoked, it can be renewed at any time within five years after the last biennial renewal date by filing a renewal application with payment of all accrued and unpaid renewal fees, including delinquency fees.

3 EXPIRED: An architect license becomes expired when it is not renewed within five years after the last biennial renewal date. The license no longer exists.

[Ref.: *BPC section 5600.2*]

What can I do? Holders of an expired license are “unlicensed” persons who may not practice architecture.

What can I call myself? Holders of an expired license are “unlicensed” persons who may not use the title “architect” or use any terms such as “architecture” or “architectural” or any term confusingly

similar in describing their qualifications and/or any services provided while operating as an “unlicensed” person.

Can it be reinstated? An expired license cannot be renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated. In order to practice architecture again, a person would have to reapply and meet all the current requirements for obtaining an original license.

[Ref.: *BPC section 5600.3*]

4 RETIRED: Holders of a current or renewable license may apply to CAB for a “retired license” as long as their license is not subject to any disciplinary action. CAB can issue such a license upon receipt of an approvable Application for Retired License and payment of a one-time fixed fee.

[Ref.: *BPC section 5600.4*]

What can I do? Holders of a “retired license” are not authorized and may not practice architecture; however, they may operate as an “unlicensed” person as is permitted in the Architects Practice Act for any other “unlicensed” person.

What can I call myself? Holders of a “retired license” are permitted to use the title “Architect Retired” or “Retired Architect;” however, they are not permitted to otherwise use the title “architect” or to use any terms such as “architecture” or “architectural” or any term confusingly similar in describing their qualifications and/or any services provided while operating as an “unlicensed” person.

Can original license be restored?

A “retired license” may be restored to active status as described for a delinquent license above.

If you have any questions about the various stages of licensure and how they apply to your situation, please contact the CAB office at (916) 574-7220.

CIDP/IDP: A Review of the Necessary Steps

ESTABLISH FILES WITH NCARB AND CAB Continued from page 1

To establish a file with NCARB, candidates are required to:

- Apply to NCARB to initiate an IDP Council Record for the purpose of establishing a verified record of training with NCARB and submit the required \$285 fee;
- Identify an individual (usually a licensed architect) as the IDP supervisor who will meet regularly with the intern (candidate) to review training progress and verify the IDP training report; and
- Choose a licensed architect as the IDP mentor to meet with the intern to review training progress and to sign the intern's IDP Training Report.

To establish a file with CAB, candidates are required to submit the *Application for Eligibility Evaluation – Architect Registration Examination* and fee of \$100. This fee is to determine eligibility for the ARE. The fee is not related to the CIDP requirement.

Once a candidate has verified five years of educational equivalents as evaluated by CAB and has been deemed eligible, he or she may begin taking the ARE. Documentation of meeting the educational/experience requirement will take the form of transcripts and/or *Employment Verification Forms*. Candidates can download the forms from the Board's Web site at www.cab.ca.gov. In California, candidates may simultaneously take and complete the ARE while participating in CIDP/IDP.

THE ROLE OF THE SUPERVISOR AND MENTOR

Candidates should select a supervisor and mentor to participate in the CIDP/IDP process. They play the following roles:

Supervisor

Roles in IDP:

- Providing reasonable opportunities for the intern to gain adequate experience in each IDP Training Area;

- Meeting regularly with the intern to review training progress and to verify the intern's IDP Training Report;
- Encouraging the intern to participate in seminars and utilize other supplementary education resources; and
- Conferring, if needed with the intern's mentor.

Roles in CIDP:

- Verifying the license status of the architect supervisor is current;
- Providing reasonable opportunities for interns to obtain experience through participation or observation in all IDP Skills and Application Activities;
- Meeting with the intern on a frequent and regular basis to thoroughly review and discuss the intern's CIDP evidence materials relative to Skills and Application Activities and providing constructive comments to help guide intern's future training plans; and
- Objectively verifying and signing off on the CIDP Evidence Verification Form for an activity when the intern has successfully completed the evidence requirement for that activity.

Mentor

Roles in IDP:

- Meeting regularly with the intern to review training progress and to sign the intern's IDP training report;
- Suggesting additional training and supplementary education activities;
- Providing guidance to enhance the intern's professional growth; and
- Conferring, if needed with the intern's supervisor.

Roles in CIDP:

- No formal responsibilities; however, plays a valuable role in the success of an intern's training and as an advisor.

MAINTAIN CIDP/IDP RECORDS

Candidates are responsible for maintaining their records with both NCARB and CAB.

For IDP, candidates are required to complete and submit the *Employment Verification/IDP Training Reports* approximately every four months until the 16 IDP Training Areas are fulfilled. Candidates can obtain the form at the NCARB Web site at www.ncarb.org/forms. Forms should be mailed to NCARB at: 1801 K Street, Suite 1100-K, Washington, D.C. 20006.

CIDP incorporates a detailed evidence requirement. Candidates are required to provide evidence of training to their supervisor in the form of work samples or written narratives for each of the 16 NCARB IDP training areas. As Skills and Application Activities and the related required evidence are completed, candidates are required to submit the *Comprehensive Intern Development Program Evidence Verification Form* to CAB. Candidates can download the form from the Board's Web site at www.cab.ca.gov/idp-main.htm. Candidates should mail the forms to CAB at: 2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105, Sacramento, CA 95834.

The CIDP evidence material is to be retained by the candidate for further reference, if necessary until he or she is licensed.

TRANSFER COMPLETED IDP RECORD

Once a candidate has fulfilled the IDP requirement, he or she needs to submit a request in writing to NCARB to have the council record transferred to CAB. Within 30 days of the request, NCARB will forward the record to CAB. After CAB receives the record, staff will review it for completeness.

Candidates are encouraged to download NCARB's *Intern Development Program Guidelines* and CAB's *Comprehensive Intern Development Program Handbook*. Both publications can be found on the Board's Web site at www.cab.ca.gov. NCARB's Web address is www.ncarb.org.

Questions regarding the CIDP/IDP requirements can be directed to CAB'S Written Examination Unit at (916) 575-7215 or emailed to cab@dca.ca.gov.



Avoiding Common Practice Complaints Closure in Every Phase Helps Manage Client Expectations

Good Risk Management is Good for Business

By Richard D. Crowell, Hon. AIACC

In a time of confusing and sometimes overlapping or conflicting codes, regulations, and laws, architects who work hard to manage their practices need all the help they can get. One often-overlooked resource is their professional liability insurance provider—the insurance company and the agent or broker who arranges their coverage.

Most enlightened insurers and agents offer a variety of excellent practice management resources to their architect-clients. These resources may include hands-on training seminars, reference books, pamphlets and manuals, contract review services, practice advice, and consultation services. These services are usually provided by the insurers and agents without cost to the insured architect.

While the insurers' principal goal is to reduce claims for their clients, most of the materials and services available also help architects run a more professional and profitable business. Several insurers have done the math and discovered that well-managed design firms have a lower likelihood of incurring claims, and those claims that do occur are more easily defended and at a lower cost.

Why is this important to you, and why is the California Architects Board interested? The Architects Practice Act contains provisions pertaining to written contracts, signing and stamping plans, construction observation, and negligence in the practice of architecture. Violation of these provisions may subject you to Board penalties as well as sanctions by a civil court. Professional liability insurers are vitally concerned about whether the architects they insure are properly licensed and in good standing with the state, or have any past or pending disciplinary actions against them. Insurers know that if you are in violation of the Practice Act, it will be more difficult to defend you in a civil action for a negligence claim.

Unfortunately, not all architects take advantage of these practice management resources. Understandably, when work is plentiful, training takes a lower priority and is often postponed. When projects are not as plentiful, all efforts are directed to finding new work, and again, training is put off. In response to this dilemma, some carriers offer incentives, such as premium reductions, to encourage participation.

Studies show that the most successful firms invest substantially in training their staff on loss prevention issues and better business practices. They have learned that establishing and consistently following good business policies; writing and negotiating reasonable client agreements; following protocols for checking drawings and specifications; and instituting solid procedures for communicating with clients, reduce the likelihood of having problem projects or incurring claims.

Continued on page 7

The architect's in-basket is never empty. There is always something that has to be done right now. Frequently, that means refocusing from one project to another more than once a day. It is no wonder a thread gets dropped occasionally. Most of the time that is not a problem; a phone call or an email from the client gets the work back on track. Sometimes the client calls the California Architects Board or files a complaint instead.

The architect typically responds in one of two ways: 1) the project was going along just fine until the client filed a complaint, or 2) the ball was in the client's court and he or she had not been heard from for awhile. Both answers indicate the same underlying problem. The architect is far out of sync with the client. It is not simply an issue of communication—it is also about expectations. Client expectations about scheduling, comprehensiveness, cost, deliverables, and follow-up must be met in all phases of the project. When the client is unclear about what to expect or the architect is unclear about what is expected, the stage is set for failure.

The issue of mutual expectations is complicated by the asymmetry in knowledge and experience between the client and the architect. This imbalance is obvious when the project is a single-family residence. But even the most seasoned shopping mall developer lacks the architect's technical expertise. This can lead the architect to assume that the client knows what to expect at the end of each project phase. For example, the owner-architect contract has a payment keyed to city planning department approval, which has an estimated date of completion. The next payment is keyed to approval of the construction documents, which has a variable date of completion depending on plan check and revisions. The project flies through planning right on time, then gets hung up in plan check. The client is pleased the planning phase went well, but fumes silently through months of plan check revisions.

When early phases move quickly and on schedule, the client may assume that every phase will proceed apace. That unrealistic expectation can be avoided by taking extra care to closeout each phase of the project with a written memo about the next phase, including its schedule, cost, deliverables, and any input requirements due from the client. Assuming the client knows what information to supply at each phase because it is defined in the contract may be legally sound, but can leave a project in limbo. The architect might well assume the client is purposely in a holding pattern for financial reasons, while the client might assume the architect is hard at work on the project. Attention to closure and expectations can better assure satisfied clients and successful projects.



Enforcement Actions

CAB is responsible for receiving and investigating complaints against licensees and unlicensed persons. CAB also retains the authority to make final decisions on all enforcement actions taken against its licensees. Included below is a brief description of recent enforcement actions taken by CAB against individuals who were found to be in violation of the Architects Practice Act. Every effort is made to ensure the following information is correct. Before making any decision based upon this information, you should contact CAB. Further information on specific violations may also be obtained by contacting the Board's Enforcement Unit at (916) 575-7208.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

RONALD ANTHONY GIDDINGS

[Alameda] Effective January 20, 2006, Ronald Anthony Giddings' architect license number C-18887 was revoked. The action was the result of a Default Decision, which was adopted by the Board.

An Accusation was filed against Giddings for alleged violations of Business and Professions Code (BPC) sections 5583 (Fraud in Practice of Architecture) and 5584 (Willful Misconduct). The Accusation alleged that Giddings entered into a contract to provide architectural services for a residential addition and remodel. The subject received a retainer in the amount of \$500 and two original drawings of the floor plan for the property. The subject failed to provide any architectural services on the project and failed to return the \$500 retainer and original drawings.

In another project, the subject entered into a contract to provide architectural services and secure permits related to a residential addition and remodel. The subject failed to provide the necessary plans for the project to enable the City of Alameda to issue permits to complete the project. The clients were required to hire another architect to complete the architectural plans at a cost of \$4,289.55.

CITATIONS

GUY A. BARTOLI [Marina del Rey] The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$1,500 civil penalty to Guy A. Bartoli, architect license number C-2568 (expired), for alleged violations of BPC section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that on or about May 3, 2004, while Bartoli's architect license was expired, he executed an "Agreement for Architectural Services" with a client to offer and provide services for a three-unit condominium located in Redondo Beach, California. It was also alleged that Bartoli used letterhead which stated "Guy A. Bartoli Architect" and was listed under the "Architects" heading on the online telephone directory, "Smartpages.com." Bartoli paid the

civil penalty satisfying the citation. The citation became effective on June 5, 2006.

BRUNO BONDANELLI

[Los Angeles] The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Bruno Bondanelli, architect license number C-29801 for alleged violations of BPC sections 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect) and 5536.1(c) (Unauthorized Practice). The action alleged that on or about October 7, 1998, Bondanelli executed a written agreement to provide design and construction observation services on two single-family, non-exempt homes; one of which was three stories and the other was four stories. Bondanelli was not issued an architect license until June 29, 2004. Bondanelli paid the civil penalty satisfying the citation. The citation became effective on January 26, 2006.

RICK CONROY [Temecula] The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$3,000 civil penalty to Rick Conroy, an unlicensed individual, for alleged violations of BPC section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Conroy executed a "Custom Architecture and Interior Design Agreement" to provide architectural design services for the remodel of a residence. The contract stated that it is "Made between Newport Architects, represented by Rick Conroy..." The contract was on letterhead that stated "Newport Architects" and described the architectural services that would be provided. The signature line for the contract stated "Rick Conroy - Newport Architects" and was signed by Conroy. Conroy prepared a "Preliminary Cost Analysis" on letterhead that stated "Newport Architects" and contained a signature block that stated "Rick Conroy Newport Architects." Conroy put out a business card stating "Newport Architects" and "Rick Conroy Principal." Conroy is a member of the Temecula Valley Chamber of Commerce (Chamber). The Chamber has a Business Directory with a heading titled "Architects." The listing stated "Newport Architects, Inc." with Conroy's name. Conroy also executed a written agreement with clients to provide

architectural services for an auto body project in Murrieta, California. The agreement stated "The contract is made between Newport Architects, hereafter referred to as 'Architect'." Conroy signed the contract above the signature line stating "Newport Architects." Conroy paid the civil penalty satisfying the citation. The citation became effective on April 17, 2006.

RENATO CORZO [Pasadena] The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Renato Corzo, an unlicensed individual for an alleged violation of BPC section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Corzo prepared plans for two single-family dwellings. The plans contained title blocks which stated "Corzo Associates" and "Architects & Planners." Corzo paid the civil penalty satisfying the citation. The citation became effective on April 18, 2006.

PETER ROBERT DAVIS [Carmel] The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Peter Robert Davis, architect license number C-21300, for an alleged violation of BPC section 5536.22(a) (Written Contract). The action alleged that Davis commenced providing architectural services for a mixed-use building and applied for a Use Permit through the City on behalf of his client, without an executed written contract. The citation became effective on April 26, 2006.

S. GLENN EICHLER II [Mission Viejo] The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to S. Glenn Eichler II, architect license number C-8791, for an alleged violation of BPC section 5584 (Negligence). The action alleged that Eichler billed his clients for 100% complete construction documents for their project, without coordinating the work of the engineers or the building department, and not obtaining building permit approval for eight months after the 100% billing. Eichler paid the civil penalty satisfying the citation. The citation became effective on May 5, 2006.

USING THE TERM "ARCHITECT"

Be Aware of Rules and Penalties

LUIS ANTONIO ROBLES (Pacifica) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$1,000 civil penalty to Luis Antonio Robles, architect license number C-21700, for alleged violations of BPC sections 5536.22 (Written Contract) and 5584 (Willful Misconduct). The action alleged that Robles commenced providing architectural services without an executed written contract. Robles provided only preliminary floor plans and exterior elevations before abandoning the project. He failed to return the client's telephone calls, causing the client to hire another architect to complete the project. Robles paid the civil penalty satisfying the citation. The citation became effective on January 26, 2006.

BEN B. SAFYARI (Los Angeles) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$1,000 civil penalty to Ben B. Safyari, an unlicensed individual for alleged violations of BPC sections 5536(a) and 5536.1(c) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Safyari entered into a contract and then prepared, drawings for a six-unit apartment building, a non-exempt project. The citation became effective on April 17, 2006.

WILLIAM RAYMOND STONEBREAKER (Rancho Santa Fe) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to William Raymond Stonebreaker, architect license number C-10952 (expired), for an alleged violation of BPC section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that while Stonebreaker's license was expired, he gave his client a business card that stated "WM. STONEBREAKER, A.I.A., ARCHITECT" which was a device that indicated to the public that he was an architect or qualified to engage in the practice of architecture. The citation became effective on April 26, 2006.

MICHAEL DEAN THOMAS (Oakland) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Michael Dean Thomas, architect license number C-5924, for an alleged violation of BPC section 5584 (Misconduct). The action alleged that Thomas did not pay one of his sub-consultants as required by the contract. The citation became effective on April 26, 2006.

FRANKLIN WILBERFORCE THORNTON (Arcadia) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Franklin Wilberforce Thornton, architect license number C-5522, for an alleged violation of BPC section 5536.22 (Written Contract). The action alleged that Thornton commenced providing architectural services by developing ideas for a property, without an executed written contract. Thornton paid the civil penalty satisfying the citation. The citation became effective on January 18, 2006.

The Board has seen an increased number of complaints against candidates regarding the misuse of the words "Architect," "Architecture," and "Architectural" and the misuse of the terms in their business devices. In addition, unlicensed individuals, including employees of architectural firms, sometimes use the words "Architect" in their job title or description, i.e., "Senior Architect," "Intern Architect," and "Project Architect."

In accordance with Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 5536, an unlicensed person cannot use any term confusingly similar to the word architect. Specifically, subsection 5536(a) of the statute states, "It is a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$5,000, or by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding one year, or by both fine and imprisonment, for any person who is not licensed to practice architecture under this chapter, to practice architecture in this state, to use any term confusingly similar to the word architect, to use the stamp of a licensed architect, as provided in section 5536.1, or to advertise or put out any sign, card, or other device that might indicate to the public that he or she is an architect or that he or she is qualified to engage in the practice of architecture or is an architectural designer."

The Candidate's Handbook also addresses this issue, stating: "Candidates and other unlicensed individuals should be aware that in California it is a misdemeanor punishable by fine and/or imprisonment to practice architecture, to offer architectural services, to represent oneself as an architect, or to use any term confusingly similar to the word architect unless one holds a current and valid license to practice architecture issued by CAB."

Candidates and firms should be more conscientious about ensuring that they are adhering to the BPC. Using the words "Architect," "Architecture," or "Architectural" or any term confusingly similar in any business devices, or identifying themselves as an architect, prior to obtaining a California architect's license could result in an enforcement action or the denial of a candidate's application for licensure.

You may reference this material at the Board's Web site: www.cab.ca.gov or contact CAB at (916) 575-7208.

Good Risk Management is Good for Business

Continued from page 5

Consider taking advantage of all the resources that are available to you. Talk to your agent about the loss prevention services and materials they provide. Call or write your insurer and ask what risk management training they have available. (If they don't provide this kind of service, consider looking elsewhere for insurance coverage.) Help is out there and the price is right!

Richard D. Crowell, Hon. AIACC, retired in 2002 after a 30 year career in the insurance industry, both as a broker heading his own agency in Orange County and as Senior VP in charge of the Architects and Engineers Program for DPIC Companies in Monterey. Dick is the author of the DPIC Contract Guide and numerous other publications on risk management. He has served for 26 years on the CAB Regulatory and Enforcement Committee and was awarded the Octavius Morgan Award in 2001, the first non-licensure so honored. He received Presidential Citations from both AIA and AIACC for his contributions to the design professions.

architects

California Architects Board

2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

Board Members

Jeffrey D. Heller, President, Architect Member
Larry Guidi, Vice President, Public Member
L. Kirk Miller, Secretary, Architect Member
Jon Alan Baker, Architect Member
Iris Cochlan, Public Member
Marilyn Lyon, Public Member
Michael Merino, Architect Member
Cynthia Choy Ong, Public Member
Norma Sklarek, Architect Member
Sheran Voigt, Public Member

Douglas R. McCauley, Executive Officer

PRSRT STD

U.S. Postage

PAID

Permit No. 626

Sacramento, CA

In This Issue Summer 2006

CIDP/IDP: A Review of the Necessary Steps	1
Four Stages of a License	3
Good Risk Management is Good Business.....	5
Avoiding Common Practice Complaints	5
Enforcement Actions	6
Using the Term "Architect": Be Aware of Rules and Penalties.....	7

Special Thanks to CAB 2005 Committee Members

The committees of the California Architects Board had a productive 2005. Each committee is driven by the volunteer efforts of a dedicated group of individuals. We would like to thank those who contributed their time in 2005.

Communications Committee

Members: Cynthia Choy Ong (Chair), Richard Conrad, Cynthia Easton, Jack Paddon, Ronald Ronconi, and Nathaniel B. Walker, IV

Examination Committee

Members: Denis Henmi (Chair), Kevin Jensen, Charles Brown, Glenn Gall, Richard Holden, George Ikenoyoma, Christine Lampert, James McGlothlin, and Carol Tink-Fox

Professional Qualifications Committee

Members: Kevin Jensen (Chair), Kirk Miller (Vice Chair), Jeffrey Heller, Norma Sklarek, Gordon Carrier, Raymond Cheng, Allan Cooper, Donald Crosby, Christine Lampert, Paul Neel, Ed Oremen, Larry Segrue, RK Stewart, and Barry Wasserman

Regulatory and Enforcement Committee

Members: Larry Guidi (Chair), John Canestro, Frank Chiu, Richard Conrad, Richard Crowell, Fred Cullum, Robert De Pietro, Robert George, Merlyn Isaak, Dennis Otsuji, and Larry Segrue

ARCHITECT REGISTRATION EXAMINATION California candidates took 9,240 divisions of the Architect Registration Examination (ARE) in 2005. Results are listed below.

DIVISION	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	TOTAL PASSED	TOTAL FAILED
Building Planning	1,035	617 (60%)	418 (40%)
Building Technology	986	595 (60%)	391 (40%)
Construction Documents & Services	1,122	747 (67%)	375 (33%)
General Structures	941	651 (69%)	290 (31%)
Lateral Forces	812	600 (74%)	212 (26%)
Materials & Methods	1,180	766 (65%)	414 (35%)
Mechanical & Electrical Systems	1,033	652 (63%)	381 (37%)
Pre-Design	1,150	772 (67%)	378 (33%)
Site Planning	981	680 (69%)	301 (31%)

CALIFORNIA SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION The California Supplemental Examination (CSE) was administered six times in 2005. A total of 968 candidates were scheduled to take the CSE in 2005, with 846 candidates being tested. Overall results for exams taken in 2005 are as follows:

TYPE OF CANDIDATE	NUMBER OF CANDIDATES	TOTAL PASSED	TOTAL FAILED
In-state First Time	344	168 (49%)	176 (51%)
In-state Repeat	265	109 (41%)	156 (59%)
Reciprocity First Time	155	71 (46%)	84 (54%)
Reciprocity Repeat	76	31 (41%)	45 (59%)
Relicensure First Time	3	1 (33%)	2 (67%)
Relicensure Repeat	3	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
TOTALS	846	382 (46%)	464 (54%)

434 new architect licenses were issued in 2005.

To Get In Touch With Us

California Architects Board • 2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105 • Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 574-7220 • Fax: (916) 575-7283 • Email: cab@dca.ca.gov • www.cab.ca.gov